

The last rays of the setting sun were melting away as aunt Harriet and Mrs. Russell were seated together in the little parlor, talking of olden times, when a carriage drove up to the gate. A manly form was soon hurrying up the gravel walk, there was a quick rap on the door, and he inquired for Mrs. Russell.

"My husband! oh, my husband!" and she rushed to the door and threw herself into his arms. He strained her to his heart, and pressed his lips on her pale cheek.

"Will you forgive my unkindness, dear Eleanor? I have heard what an angel you have been. How foolish I was to doubt your love! Can you forgive me?"

"Yes, I have learned that lesson," and she smiled through glad tears of joy as she said, "will you forgive me?"

"I have, dearest one, a thousand times. I am now wealthy, and we will be so happy—my wife and children."

#### The Atlantic Sub-Marine Cable.

Considerable uneasiness is felt about the success of this enterprise. The fleet has at last been heard from, however, which, under the circumstances, gives hope of success. A vessel (the Blue Jacket, from Liverpool), arrived on Monday, at St. John's, N. F., reports seeing the vessels on the 24th of June—but, as the captain had no code of signals, he could not communicate with them, though signals were made to him from the fleet. This is provoking. The fleet were then fourteen days at sea, and the latitude and longitude (51.32 north, 32 west) show them not to have been far from mid-ocean, and, therefore, near the place appointed for splicing the cable. It will be remembered that the arrangements before leaving England was, that the wire should be united in lat. 52 02, long. 33 18, and it was expected that operations for depositing it in its watery bed would commence about the 20th of June—that is to say, four days before the fleet was fallen in with by the Blue Jacket. The weather, as we have seen from the reports of about every vessel crossing their track, has been anything but favorable for the work, and so a liberal allowance must be made for delays and miscellaneous incident under these circumstances to the nature of an enterprise which is, after all, but a magnificent experiment.

Nineteen days have thus elapsed since the Blue Jacket passed the vessels, in or near mid-ocean. If it took them fourteen to get there, it is but reasonable to allow them, say twenty days or more, to work their way back to the opposite shores—their speed being necessarily much reduced under the process of paying out the cable. If everything goes on well, then—and if this calculation holds good—it will be time enough to expect the arrival of the Niagara at Trinity Bay the last of this week or the first part of next. And if from bad weather, the commencement of operations after they arrived at the spot was delayed, the time of the arrival may be still later. It must be recollected that the fleet were to go to the rendezvous under sail and not under steam. A steamer under sail is not less liable to be baffled by wind and weather than a properly rigged ship, and it has never been the custom to count with precision or certainty upon the hour or day that a ship will complete a sea voyage of voyage of fifteen hundred miles. Orders were given to the respective commanders of the fleet of the following tenor: If the cable should break after a certain length (250 miles) had been paid out, it was to be reeled after recovering as much as possible; and if such a breakage occurred after more than that length had been laid from each ship, and before soundings of two hundred fathoms were reached, the efforts should be abandoned and the ships should return to Queenstown for orders. In the latter contingency we shall have to wait some time for information.

#### Slavery in Missouri.

An agitation is in progress all over Missouri, on the question of making that a free State. The main argument of the pro-slavery party against it, is that advanced by the St. Louis Republican, to the effect that it would cost too much to pay for the freedom of the slaves. To this the St. Louis Democrat replies that it is not necessary to pay for them, and it proceeds to show by statistics how the increase of free emigration carries with it the natural diminution of the slaves, by the following counties:

| Counties.     | Census of 1851. |         | Census of 1856. |         |
|---------------|-----------------|---------|-----------------|---------|
|               | Whites.         | Slaves. | Whites.         | Slaves. |
| Gasconade,    | 4326            | 104     | 3534            | 40      |
| St. Francois, | 1285            | 1021    | 3033            | 723     |
| Cole,         | 5771            | 1637    | 3210            | 898     |

The Democrat also points to St. Louis, St. Charles, Osage, Harrison, Crawford, and twenty other counties, in which slavery is fast disappearing. It is a most curious fact that these counties are mostly in the middle and southern sections of the State. Of those we have named, St. Louis, St. Charles, Osage, Cole, Gasconade, and St. Francois, lie along the Missouri river from its mouth to the center of the State. A few years ago this very same river was infested by lawless banditti, who refused to permit free emigration by that channel to Kansas. It seems that, like the dog in the manger, in grasping at a shadow they have lost a reality.

WHAT NEXT?—A patent has been issued for an improvement on skirt hoops. Not being up in those things, we cannot explain in what particular the new article is an improvement on former efforts, but we give the specification of the patentee, which will probably be all plain to the skirt-enriched, though it is all Greek to us. He claims "the peculiar formation of a slide, made of brass or other metal; also the securing the hoop to the perpendicular straps, and the formation of a bustle or corrugated projection on the upper hoops on the back of the skirt."

## TRUE NORTHERNER.

T. R. HARRISON, Editors.

S. H. BLACKMAN, Editors.

OFFICIAL PAPER OF THE COUNTY.

PAW PAW.

FRIDAY, JULY 23, 1858.

### "X."

Subscribers receiving their papers with the above mark placed opposite their names, will know that the time for which they subscribed has expired.

#### Republican State Convention.

A Republican State Convention, for the nomination of State Officers, will be held at the City of Detroit, on Thursday, August 19th next, at 12 o'clock, M.

Each county will be entitled to two Delegates for each Senator and Representative in the State Legislature. Where two or more counties are united in one Senatorial District, the two counties having the largest population will each be entitled to one Senatorial Delegate.

Each organized county having no representative will be entitled to one delegate.

J. M. EDWARDS, W. W. MURPHY,  
M. H. MILES, MARSH GORDON,  
ERNEST PRINGLE, CHAS. T. GORDMAN,  
JAMES SULLIVAN, R. E. TROBRIDGE,  
J. J. NEWELL, State Central Committee.  
Detroit, June 25th, 1858.

#### Republican County Convention.

A Republican County Convention will be held at the Court House in Paw Paw, on Saturday the 14th day of August next, for the purpose of electing delegates to the State Convention to be held at Detroit, Aug. 19th, and to the Senatorial and Congressional Conventions; and for such other business as may come before the meeting.

Agenda: 1. Antislavery; 2. Arlington; 3. Bloomfield; 4. Branch; 5. Columbus; 6. Dearborn; 7. Deerpark; 8. Geneva; 9. Hamilton; 10. Hartford; 11. Keeler; 12. Lafayette; 13. Lawrence; 14. Porter; 15. Pine Grove; 16. South Haven; 17. Waverly; 18. Waukegan.

FABRIS MILES,  
NELSON ROWE,  
S. H. BLACKMAN,  
Rep. Co. Committee.

#### Reply to "H."

My article on the mutations of the Democratic party, in the Northern of July 9th, signed "B," has called out a very spirited rejoinder, (not a reply,) from the correspondent "H" of the Paw Paw Free Press in the issue of July 12th.

After a little second-hand slang about my being "spewed out of the democratic party," (which I can easily forgive, as he is entirely dependent on others, for as he is entirely dependent on others, he asserts that "my statement of the principles of the democratic party, are recklessly, if not wilfully false." It is very easy to say that a thing is false, but it is not always quite so easy to prove it. And as "H" has not attempted the latter, I deem a reply to his assertion unnecessary until he can point out wherein my statement was not true, and offer some proof of the same. And I would respectfully invite to him, the task of making good his sweeping assertion.

In that article I stated that "the right of the people to determine their own institutions when they came to force a State Constitution, was not an issue between the parties in the last campaign." This he undertakes to quote, and thinks it will astonish our readers; but he leaves out the words, "between the parties;" making it read, "was not an issue in the last campaign;" which, although it may not materially change the sense when rightly understood, is still calculated to convey a very different impression when disconnected with the sentence that immediately follows; which is that "the Republicans never denied that doctrine." As quoted by him, it might be taken by some, to mean that, that subject was not talked about by either of the parties. Now, although one party might have affirmed that doctrine, yet if the other party did not deny it, it was not an issue between the parties. And if "H" can find any denial of that principle in the Republican Platform, or in the resolutions of their conventions, let him produce it.

But the democratic Platform does not affirm that doctrine. It simply recognizes the right of the people of the territories, when the number of their inhabitants justifies it, "to form a constitution, with, or without slavery," and be admitted into the union on an equal footing with the other states, etc. To determine their own institutions, and to determine simply in regard to the one institution of slavery, are two very different propositions. And how can any one pretend that the former was "an issue between the parties," if there was no distinct affirmation, or denial of it by either party.

He seems alarmed for fear that the Republicans are going to steal the democratic thunder of Popular Sovereignty. But I cannot see why they should feel particularly anxious about it, if we should, since they have virtually abandoned it, as I intend to show before I get through with this discussion. But they need have no fears about it; for the Popular Sovereignty that we believe in, is a very different article from theirs. It is something more and better than simply and exclusively the right to hold slaves; which is all that the Popular Sovereignty of the Kansas Nebraska Bill amounts to, President Buchanan himself being judge. For he maintains that said Bill guaranteed to the people in adopting their constitution,

the submission of nothing but the question of slavery.

But "H" proceeds to propound to me quite a number of interrogatories, which he seems to think, show an inconsistency in myself and other individuals who have left the democratic party, and requests me to answer them; expressing a willingness also on his part to reciprocate by answering any that I may propound. This appears very fair, and I am disposed to accept the proposition. But his questions are put with such a want of arrangement and perspicuity, that I shall not take them all up in the same order in which they are propounded; and as several questions are grouped into one, in several instances, I shall be under necessity of considering several of them together.

He asks how I reconcile the position I am "trying" to assume, with the Republican platform of 1856?

As this question is rather vague, I answer it by saying that I can find nothing in the Platform referred to, inconsistent with the position that I am trying to assume, or that needs reconciling therewith. If you can, will you be so good as to point it out?

The next question that I shall take up is the following:

"Did not you in concert with many others, who are now recognized as leaders of the Black Republican party of this State, in 1848, support Gen. Cass, and the doctrine of the Nicholson Letter?"

As the answer to this question will involve, in a considerable degree, the answers to several of the others, I shall endeavor to answer it pretty fully. But before I proceed I wish to remark that the questions, which are designed to show the inconsistency of myself, and others, as individuals, if they should show it ever so successfully, would not show that the Republican party had changed; nor would it relieve the democratic party from the fact of having undergone the mutations which I ascribed to them in my former article. And it would not place us in worse position than most of the present democratic leaders; for even Douglas, Bigler and Buchanan desired the benefit of "a statute of limitations" for their political acts; whereas I think it will be found that I and my associates will not be under the necessity of pleading a statute of limitations.

The above interrogatory embodies two distinct questions. To the first clause—"Did you not, in 1848 support Gen. Cass?" I answer, Yes.

To the latter clause—"Did you not in 1848, support the doctrine of the Nicholson Letter?" I answer, No.

These are my answers; Now for the proof.

In 1848, the democratic party "of this State," and of the other northern States, did not maintain the doctrine of the Nicholson Letter. On the contrary, they were at that time, by their acts, and by the resolutions passed at their conventions, and by the public avowals of their leading men, committed to a doctrine in direct conflict with the doctrine of that letter, namely the very doctrine now advocated by the Republican party; That Congress has the right to prohibit slavery in the territories, and that it is expedient for them to do so; while Gen. Cass was almost the only, if not in fact the only prominent man among them that proclaimed the doctrine of that letter. But, as Gen. Cass had received the nomination of the party, they chose to support him, notwithstanding the difference of views in this particular, rather than to abandon their party and support the opposing candidate.

To prove this statement I shall refer, first to the opinions advanced by some of their leading men; and next, to resolutions and public acts of their conventions and legislative bodies.

The Hon. Charles E. Stuart was in 1848 the democratic candidate for representative in Congress from this district. In a letter written by him in Oct., 1847, he avowed the following sentiments:

"So far as the slave states have rights under the constitution, they should, in my opinion, be held inviolate. But in the organization of territorial governments, whether out of our present possessions or such as we may hereafter acquire, a provision ought in my opinion, to be incorporated prohibiting slavery. Upon this subject I think we have an undoubted right to act, and I also think that the true spirit of philanthropy in addition to our interest, requires every good citizen to act in favor of liberty."

Mr. Stuart has never since repudiated the doctrine of that letter; and in 1849 he made an able speech in Congress in favor of the Wilmot Proviso.

Hon. Robert McClelland a democratic member of Congress, from another district in this State, and since a member of Pierce's Administration, also made a speech, at the same session, in favor of the same doctrine.

Governor Ransom, democratic governor

of this State, in his annual Message in 1849, took strong ground in favor of the same doctrine.

But, to show that this was not merely the sentiment of a few individuals, but was really the professed doctrine of the party, we will next refer to some of their resolutions.

As a sample of the resolutions passed at some of the democratic County Conventions, we give the following, passed by the democratic County Convention of Monroe county, in 1849.

"Resolved, That we are in favor of the 'Jefferson Ordinance of 1787—that we 'sanction the action of the past administration of James K. Polk, in excluding 'slavery from the Oregon Territory, and that we are in favor of using all constitutional means to prevent slavery from being introduced, or extended, into the 'free territories of the United States.'"

They "supported Gen. Cass in 1848; but they don't seem to have adopted the doctrine of the Nicholson Letter. Were they inconsistent?"

In Washtenaw County the same year, they resolved as follows:

"Resolved, That we are decidedly opposed to the further extension of slavery 'within the territories of the United States, but we are not in favor of making opposition to, or advocacy of such 'extension, a political test.'"

In both Wayne county and Oakland county they passed resolutions against making individual opinions on the slavery question a political test. So it seems that they did not think that by voting for Gen. Cass they adopted the doctrine of the Nicholson Letter.

But the foregoing are only the expression of County Conventions. The following was passed at the democratic State Convention held at Jackson, Sept. 19th, 1849, of which Hon. Samuel Clark was president, and Wilbur F. Storey, present Editor of the Detroit Free Press, was a member of the committee on resolutions.

"Resolved, That we are opposed to the 'extension of slavery in the Territories of 'New Mexico and California, believing 'them to be now free, in virtue of the 'laws of Mexico, and that its establishment in either of these territories ought 'to be prevented.'"

In 1847, the democratic Legislature of this State passed the following joint resolution—which may be found in the Session Laws of that year.

"Resolved, That in the acquisition of 'any new territory, whether by purchase, 'conquest or otherwise, we deem it the 'duty of the general government to extend over the same the ordinance of '1787, with all its rights, privileges and 'immunities.'"

But, if any thing more is required to prove that the democratic party of this State did not support the doctrine of the Nicholson Letter in 1848, although they did support Gen. Cass personally, I think the following ought to settle the question "satisfactorily."

In 1848, at the same election at which the democracy of Michigan voted for Gen. Cass, they elected a State Legislature.—That legislature was so thoroughly democratic that it was said of it that the opposition had not a corporal's guard. There was not much, if any, over a dozen members of the opposition in both branches.—And it cannot be denied, that, coming from all the different parts of the State, they represented, and were the fair exponents of the democratic sentiment throughout the State at that time.

And yet that legislature passed the following joint resolutions by an overwhelming majority. They may be found in the Session Laws of 1849.

"Resolved, That we are in favor of the 'fundamental principles of the Ordinance of '1787—and although we respect the 'opinion of many eminent statesmen and 'jurists, that slavery is a mere local institution which cannot exist without positive laws authorizing its existence—YET 'WE BELIEVE THAT CONGRESS HAS THE 'POWER, AND THAT IT IS THEIR 'DUTY TO PROHIBIT BY LEGISLATIVE 'ENACTMENT, the introduction or extension of slavery within any of the territories of the United States, now or hereafter to be acquired.'"

"Resolved, That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives requested to use all honorable means to accomplish the object expressed in the foregoing resolution, and that the Governor of this State be requested to forward copies of these resolutions to our Senators and Representatives in Congress."

But this sentiment was not confined to the democracy of this State. Similar resolutions to the above were passed by them, in all or nearly all of the Northern States. I might go on and fill up this paper with extracts and quotations similar to those above, passed by democratic assemblies, or put forth by prominent democratic statesmen. But space will not permit, neither is it necessary.

The space allotted me will not allow me to answer all your questions this week, but they will be attended to in due time. In the meantime I propose a few questions to you on the points that I have alluded to.

Did not the Democracy of this State support Gen. Cass in 1848?

Did they, at that time, sustain the doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty, as expounded in the Nicholson Letter?

Can you find anything in the Republican Platform of 1856, denying to the people of the territories the right to determine their own institutions when they come to form a State constitution?

Did not the doctrine of Popular Sovereignty, as expounded in the Nicholson Letter, and the Nebraska Bill; and as proclaimed by the journals and orators of the Democratic party from 1854 to 1856, declare that the people of the territories in their Territorial capacity have the right and the power to determine whether slavery shall exist among them or not?

Have they not since repudiated that doctrine, and now declare that the people of the territories have no right to prohibit or prevent the existence of slavery among them?

Did not they hold the doctrine in 1849 and 1850, that the Territories of New Mexico and Utah were free territories, and that slavery was effectually prohibited therein by force of the existing Mexican laws?

Do they not now declare that slavery and not freedom, is the legal condition of these Territories by force of the constitution of the United States?

Did not their editors and orators, in 1854, proclaim that slavery could not exist in Kansas, that it was precluded by the laws of immigration, by the laws of climate and productions, etc.?

Has not the result shown, and have not they since admitted, that slavery has existed and does exist there; notwithstanding a very large majority of her people are violently opposed to it?

Do you not, by your support of the present administration, endorse the Lecompton Constitution, and the action of the democratic party in Congress in favor of it, together with the English Substitute?

And have you not admitted, in conversation, that the English Substitute, so-called, looked very much like presenting one rule for the admission of a slave state, and a different rule for the admission of a free state?

I think, if you answer all the foregoing you will find that I have laid out sufficient business for you for the present.

In my next I shall attend to your questions relating to the compromises of 1850 and the Missouri Compromise, and the legislation of 1850 and '54, etc. And then I shall have some questions for you in relation thereto.

Now sir you have invited me to this discussion, and notwithstanding you threw out some personalities, I have avoided retaliation on that point, and have endeavored to answer your questions as far as I gone, with candor and frankness. And as you have, in a subsequent issue, expressed your willingness to enter into "HONORABLE COMBAT" with me on these subjects, I trust, that, avoiding personalities and slang, you will apply yourself frankly and candidly to the subjects in hand.

While it was doubtful whether Davis' head was doomed to roll from the block to make complete the locustomb of Douglas men to sacrifice to the Buchanan Deity—Lecompton, it was boldly asserted by the leading locofocos in this vicinity, that the Democratic party was dead, past resurrection, if Bagg should be appointed in his (Davis') place.

But now they have found an antidote for all their ills. Let Buchanan and Cass do what they will, no dissensions can be henceforth created in the Democratic ranks. The prisoners in the jail of Van Buren county have broken out! This fact will harmonize all the discordant elements in their ranks; Lecompton and anti-Lecompton are all one now; Buchanan and Douglas may now embrace each other; Cass and Stuart are no longer at variance. Such is the fact if the frolicking correspondent of the Free Press is a true exponent of that party. He seems to be highly "tickled" at his recent discovery, and has doubtless with his "brethren" had frequent jollifications over this universal panacea for the numerous ills that have afflicted the democracy for the past year.

In one of his ecstatic moods, he proceeds to "pitch into" the "County officials" with a wonderful deal of gusto. He says: "The campaign opened with the attempt to capture Charley Cross, and since that time, it has been prosecuted with unabating vigor, until our jail has been stocked with criminals." Now the correspondent of the Free Press knows nothing at all about what he asserts, or he knows this statement is false.

Instead of the campaign opening with the attempt to capture Charley Cross, there have been complaints made and investigated almost every week, since the Circuit

Court sat in April. Henry Crum was in jail weeks before Cross was thought of. A burglary was committed in this village and greater "attempts" were made to apprehend the offender, than any of those that the correspondent of the Free Press speaks of.

Men were taken up and fined for larceny, before the "campaign opened." Can we have more palpable proof of the miserable extremity to which the democratic party of this State are driven than that those who claim to be its exponents, come out publicly and take sides with counterfeiters, thieves and burglars?

But we will not take time to comment on this phase of the democracy of the county. Other assertions of the correspondent of the Free Press are equally as false as the one we have quoted. One would suppose by reading his heterogeneous conglomeration that no one had any thing to do with prosecuting criminals but the "County officials"—that they and they only take any notice of crime.

Fortunately for society there are some men even in the democratic party, who are not so far gone, as to wish anarchy to prevail rather than not carry out party ends. Out of more than twenty complaints and prosecutions begun since the Circuit Court adjourned, only ONE has been commenced by a county officer. All the rest have been commenced by private individuals. As for the exalted position of the individual whom the "County officials" undertook to disgrace for their own aggrandizement, we would ask the correspondent of the Free Press to define a little more minutely, what and where that man's position is. Did he leave the county because he had been "prosecuted" or because he was told by his best friends that if he staid here he would be prosecuted? We forbear to say anything of the personal slang of the correspondent of the Free Press. It hurts no one unless he condescends to answer it.

From the Detroit Advertiser.  
Old Epaphrodite, a Model Border Ruffian.

It would be a waste of ink for us to tell the people of Michigan that ex-Governor and ex-Judge Epaphroditus Ransom was a most consummate and accomplished demagogue. That fact, is as familiar as "household words" with the people of this State, who have watched all his turnings, and twistings and backings and fillings on the political chess board. Endowed by nature with all the instincts and perquisites for a "thorough bred" locofoco, with the treasury-eating stripes, rings, spots and marks about his political frame, he had just presumption enough, with an exceedingly thickhead, and maddening intellect, to foist himself upon the democratic party, whose available timber was very scarce; to occupy a seat upon Supreme bench. Subsequently, wishing to be rid of him in so responsible a position effecting the judicial character of the State, the party acceded to the wishes of the bar, and the people, by transferring him to the gubernatorial chair.

It was then that the ghost of "free soil," haunted his dreams of future greatness and with the agility of a clumsy vaulter he tumbled into Wilmot provisoism, and delivered the strongest kind of free soil message to the Legislature. Things not taken the turn he expected, when the ebb receded, he was found floundering in the dry sand along the shore, having lost the confidence and respect of all parties.—When the border ruffian troubles broke out in Kansas, he was keen enough to see that there was a field of labor to him and he emigrated to Fort Scott, the very head quarters of desperadoes, robbers, and Administration border ruffians, where he has been "chief among ten thousand"—or less. He had a government commission slipped into his pocket, to steady his nerve and keep him from the free soil shute, and has acted in perfect harmony with the notorious bandit, Hamilton, and Clark, the murderer of Barber, and Brockett, and McKay, and the other leaders of the border ruffians.

Under the auspices of these most distinguished marauders, things got so bad in the neighborhood of Fort Scott, that Capt. Montgomery went there with an army of freedom, for the deliverance of free State people who were being robbed and murdered by Hamilton and his gang. There being adverse reports relative to the nature of the outrages and the justice of the acts of Montgomery, Governor Denver went there with several other distinguished gentlemen, to investigate the difficulties. The town is guarded by United States soldiers and Green Clark the murderer of Barber, never goes out of the range of their protection. He has not been out of town for months, and it was said would not dare to stay in it if the troops were withdrawn. A correspondent of the Cincinnati Gazette, who accompanied the Governor, writes:

"The pro-slavery men also admitted that Hamilton, Brockett and McKay had made the town their headquarters for marauding expeditions on Free State men; that they brought in horses and other stolen property; and that though the property was followed and proven by the owners, it could never be recovered, but was removed by connivance and even assistance of the citizens."

The same writer also gives the following cold-blooded and heartless remark of Epaphrodite, which shows how heartily he is now enlisted in the service of Buchanan border ruffians:

"It is also admitted by them that Ex-